

A SUM-PRODUCT THEOREM IN FUNCTION FIELDS

THOMAS F. BLOOM AND TIMOTHY G. F. JONES

ABSTRACT. Let A be a finite subset of $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$, the field over Laurent series in $1/t$ over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. We show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a constant C dependent only on ϵ and q such that $\max\{|A + A|, |AA|\} \geq C|A|^{6/5-\epsilon}$. In particular such a result is obtained for the rational function field $\mathbb{F}_q(t)$. A version in terms of the multiplicative energy of A is also obtained.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let A be a non-empty finite subset of a ring. Consider the sumset

$$A + A = \{a + b : a, b \in A\}$$

and the product set

$$AA = \{ab : a, b \in A\}.$$

It is conjectured that at least one of $A + A$ or AA must be large whenever A is not close to being a subring. Here ‘large’ means of cardinality at least $\Omega(|A|^{1+\delta})$ for $\delta > 0$. In what follows we say that δ is permissible for A if for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\max(|AA|, |A + A|) \gg_{\delta, \epsilon} |A|^{1+\delta-\epsilon}.$$

Erdős and Szemerédi [1983] conjectured that 1 is permissible for any finite set of integers. The best-known result towards this is due to Solymosi [2009], who showed that $1/3$ is permissible for any finite set of reals. Konyagin and Rudnev [2012] have recently extended this result to complex numbers. Previous results in the real and complex settings can be found in Elekes [1997], Ford [1998], Nathanson [1997], Solymosi [2005b,a].

Much has also been achieved in the finite field setting. In a finite field of prime order, Bourgain et al. [2004] proved the existence of an absolute constant $\delta > 0$ which is permissible for any $A \subset \mathbb{F}_p$ for any prime p , whenever A is not too close to being the whole field $\mathbb{F}_p$. More generally, Tao [2009] extended this result to general rings whenever A is not too close to being a subring.

Garaev made the Bourgain-Katz-Tao result explicit in two cases: when $|A| > p^{2/3}$ [Garaev, 2008] and when $|A| < p^{1/2}$ [Garaev, 2007]. The former estimate is sharp, but the latter has been subsequently improved [see Bourgain and Garaev, 2009, Katz and Shen, 2008a, Li, 2011, Shen, 2008]. The most recent result is that $1/11$ is permissible whenever $|A| < p^{1/2}$, due to Rudnev [2012]. Li and Roche-Newton [2011] built on a technique of Katz and Shen [2008b] to extend this estimate to any finite field, not necessarily of prime order, so long as A is not too close to being a subfield.

The authors are both supported by an EPSRC doctoral training grant.

In this paper we consider sum-product estimates for $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$, the field of Laurent series over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. We shall show that for subsets of such fields $1/5$ is permissible.

We indicate possible applications to constructions in theoretical computer science below, for which it is likely only an appeal to the theorem over $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$ is necessary, which follows immediately since $\mathbb{F}_q[t] \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$.

We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *For any finite $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$|A + A|^3 |AA|^2 \gg_{\epsilon, q} |A|^{6-\epsilon}.$$

A sum-product result for $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ follows immediately.

Corollary 1.2. *For any finite $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\max\{|A + A|, |AA|\} \gg_{\epsilon, q} |A|^{1+\frac{1}{5}-\epsilon}$$

The sum-product exponent of $1/5$ for $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ lies between the $1/11$ known for finite fields and the $1/3$ known for $\mathbb{R}$. It is natural to conjecture that the correct answer for $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ is 1 .

For many applications, in particular those to exponential sums and thence to theoretical computer science, it is more useful to have a sum-product theorem in terms of the multiplicative energy of the set A . Recall that the multiplicative energy of A is defined by

$$E_{\times}(A) = |\{(a, b, c, d) \in A^4 : ab = cd\}|.$$

Our methods yield the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *For any finite $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$|A + A|^3 |A|^{26+\epsilon} \gg_{\epsilon, q} E_{\times}(A)^{10}.$$

We remark that the dependence on q in the implicit constants cannot be removed, since $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ contains $\mathbb{F}_q$ as a subfield, which is closed under both addition and multiplication.

This contrasts with the finite field setting for sum-products, where we think of q as being large, as it is an upper bound for the cardinality of our sets. Clearly any finite field sum-product result for which the constants depended on q would be meaningless, since we could write everything as $O_q(1)$.

Aside from their intrinsic interest these theorems may have applications to constructions in theoretical computer science. Sum-product results over finite fields have seen recent applications to extractors; see for example Bourgain [2005]. A key idea in these previous applications is the observation that a string of n bits, that is, an element of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, can be interpreted as an element of the field $\mathbb{F}_{2^n}$ so that the full power of the sum-product machinery can be brought to bear. An alternative is to interpret it as an element of $\mathbb{F}_2[t]$. Given that the sum-product results now available in $\mathbb{F}_2[t]$ are better than those in $\mathbb{F}_{2^n}$ (that is an exponent of $1/5$ rather than $1/11$) we expect that constructions along a similar line to those in Bourgain [2005] will be quantitatively stronger over $\mathbb{F}_2[t]$ rather than $\mathbb{F}_{2^n}$.

For number theory and geometric applications it is worth pointing out that any global function field, that is, a field of transcendence degree 1 over a finite field,

can be embedded into $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ for some q , where q depends only on the field of constants and genus of the function field. In particular Theorem 1.1 will also hold for any finite subset of a global function field.

Finally, we remark that it is crucial to the result that the field of constants for $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ is finite. Obtaining a sum-product result in, say, $\mathbb{Q}(t)$ requires a different approach, and has been done with a non-explicit exponent by Croot and Hart [2010] (whose methods would also likely lead to a sum-product result over $\mathbb{F}_q(t)$ but almost certainly with a weaker exponent).

The approach used in this paper is based on a geometric argument used by Solymosi [2005a] in the complex numbers, coupled with some striking structural properties that arise from the non-archimedean geometry of global function fields.

The next section provides more of the necessary background on function fields, and explains the structure of the proof and the rest of the paper.

2. FUNCTION FIELDS

Let $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ be the field of Laurent series over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ with q elements. Recall that elements of $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ have the shape

$$\sum_{i \leq N} a_i t^i,$$

where $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$, for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}$. Throughout this paper q will be reserved for the size of $\mathbb{F}_q$ and p for the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}_q$, so that q is a power of p .

There is a non-archimedean norm on $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ given by $\|x\| = q^{\deg x}$ where $\deg$ is the familiar degree map; that is, if

$$x = \sum_{i \leq N} a_i t^i$$

and $a_N \neq 0$ then we say that $\deg x = N$. We define $\|0\| = 0$. This has the crucial non-archimedean property

$$\|x + y\| \leq \max(\|x\|, \|y\|)$$

and furthermore

$$\|kx\| = \|x\|$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p \nmid k$. Both of these properties will be used frequently without further mention in what follows. As a consequence of the non-archimedean property $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ has an unusually rigid geometry, which will be exploited when proving sum-product estimates. A particular concern will be the behaviour of balls, which are sets of the form

$$B(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1})) : \|x - y\| \leq r\}.$$

We will call $r \in \mathbb{R}$ the radius of the ball $B(x, r)$. The non-archimedean property implies the following properties which are considered standard.

Lemma 2.1. *If B_1 and B_2 are balls in $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ then either they are disjoint, or $B_1 \subset B_2$, or $B_2 \subset B_1$. If in addition B_1 and B_2 have the same radius then either they are disjoint or $B_1 = B_2$.*

Proof. Let $B_1 = B(x, r)$ and $B_2 = B(y, s)$. If there exists $a \in B(x, r) \cap B(y, s)$ then

$$\|x - y\| \leq \max\{\|a - x\|, \|a - y\|\} \leq \max\{r, s\}.$$

If $r \leq s$ then this implies $B(x, r) \subset B(y, s)$ since if $b \in B(x, r)$ then

$$\|y - b\| \leq \max\{\|y - x\|, \|b - x\|\} \leq \max\{r, s\} = s.$$

Conversely if $s \leq r$ then $B(y, s) \subset B(x, r)$. Hence if $r = s$ then $B(x, r) = B(y, s)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ and let $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If A is contained in a ball of radius r , then the k -fold sumset kA is also contained in a ball of radius r .*

Proof. If A is contained in the ball $B(x, r)$ then it follows immediately from the non-archimedean property that kA is contained in the ball $B(kx, r)$. $\square$

The theorem we shall actually prove is one involving partial product sets. If $G \subset A^2$ then we define the partial product set by

$$A \overset{G}{\cdot} A = \{ab : (a, b) \in G\}.$$

The use of this lies in the following crucial lemma (which in fact holds in any multiplicative group), which relates multiplicative energy to partial product sets. For a proof see, for example, Tao and Vu [2006, Lemma 2.30].

Lemma 2.3. *For any finite $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ there exists a graph $G \subset A \times A$ such that*

$$|G| \gg \frac{E_{\times}(A)}{|A|}$$

and

$$\left| A \overset{G}{\cdot} A \right| \ll \frac{|A|^4}{E_{\times}(A)}.$$

The implicit constants are absolute.

To prove both Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 it suffices to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4. *For any finite $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$, graph $G \subset A^2$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$q|A|^{10+\epsilon}|A+A|^3 \left| A \overset{G}{\cdot} A \right|^2 \gg_{\epsilon} |G|^8.$$

Theorem 1.1 follows by taking $G = A^2$ and Theorem 1.3 follows by invoking Lemma 2.3.

The proof of Theorem 2.4 builds upon an approach of Solymosi [2005a] for sum-products in $\mathbb{C}$. When adapting this method, the non-archimedean geometry of function fields turns out to be a mixed blessing.

First, the bad news. Solymosi's argument fails at a critical point in the function field setting, for the following reason. For each $a \in A$, let $a' \in A \setminus \{a\}$ be such that $\|a - a'\|$ is minimal, and let B_a be the ball of radius $\|a - a'\|$ centred on a . Solymosi's method uses the crucial fact that a single complex number can be contained in at most $O(1)$ of the B_a . This fails spectacularly in $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$, where an element could be contained in as many as $|A|$ of the B_a , as demonstrated by the following example: let

$$A = \{t^j : 0 \leq j \leq n\}$$

so that

$$B_{t^j} = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1})) : |x| \leq q^j\}$$

for $j \geq 1$ and $B_1 = B_t$, meaning that every one of the $|A|$ balls contains 0 as an element.

But all is not lost. In the example above, the astute reader will notice that $|A + A| \approx |A|^2$, and so a strong-sum product estimate holds despite the failure of Solymosi's argument. In fact we will be able to show that something like this is possible whenever Solymosi's argument fails, by considering a special type of structure to be defined in the following section: separable sets.

Separability is fairly unexciting in the complex setting, as it holds trivially for any non-empty finite set, but in the non-archimedean regime of function fields it is a stronger notion. The rigid geometry makes it harder to find separable sets, but where they do exist it will in fact imply the existence of large sumsets. The idea, therefore, is to show that many large separable sets must exist whenever Solymosi's argument fails. Combining this with an analysis of separable sets as having large sumsets will lead to a proof of Theorem 2.4.

In what follows, Section 3 analyses separable sets and develops the necessary results about their sumsets. Section 4 then adapts Solymosi's proof from Solymosi [2005a] to establish that if $|A + A|$ and $|A \cdot^G A|$ are both small then there must exist many large separable sets, and uses this to prove Theorem 2.4. One of the virtues of Solymosi's proof is that it is very robust, allowing for partial product sets and also the creation of extra structure, both of which are exploited to obtain the full strength of Theorem 2.4.

3. SEPARABLE SETS

This section analyses sumsets of separable sets in $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$. A finite set $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ is *separable* if its elements can be indexed as

$$A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$$

in such a way that for each $1 \leq j \leq |A|$ there is a ball B_j with

$$A \cap B_j = \{a_1, \dots, a_j\}.$$

We say that the balls B_j *separate* A . Additionally, we say that a separable set A has *resolution* at least r if there are balls B_j separating A such that B_j has radius at least r for all $1 \leq j \leq |A|$.

It is an immediate consequence of the definition that a subset of a separable set with resolution at least r is itself separable with resolution at least r . The principal result of this section, and the only one carried forward, is the following.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i$ be a disjoint union of separable sets A_i , each of cardinality at least K . Then*

$$|kA| \gg_k N^{1/k} K^{k-1}$$

for any natural number k .

A first step to proving Lemma 3.1 is to consider sumsets of an individual separable set. The following lemma shows that all sumsets of such a set have near maximal size.

Lemma 3.2. *If $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ is a finite separable set then*

$$|kA| \gg_k |A|^k$$

for any natural number k .

Proof. Let $E_k(A)$ denote the k -fold additive energy of A , i.e. the number of solutions to

$$(1) \quad a_1 + \dots + a_k = b_1 + \dots + b_k$$

with $a_i, b_i \in A$. For $x \in kA$ write $\mu(x)$ for the number of solutions to $x = a_1 + \dots + a_k$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$|A|^{2k} = \left(\sum_{x \in kA} \mu(x) \right)^2 \leq |kA| E_k(A)$$

and so it suffices to show that $E_k(A) \ll_k |A|^k$, i.e. that there are at most $O_k(|A|^k)$ solutions to (1).

Say that a solution to (1) is trivial if at least $2k - 1$ of the $2k$ terms occur with multiplicity at least 2. By elementary counting there are at most $O_k(|A|^k)$ trivial solutions, so it suffices to show that there are no non-trivial solutions.

Suppose for a contradiction that a non-trivial solution to (1) exists. Gathering terms gives an expression of the form

$$(2) \quad n_1 c_1 + \dots + n_t c_t = 0$$

where the c_i are distinct elements of A and $n_i \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$. The assumption of non-triviality implies that $t \geq 2$. Additionally, note that

$$(3) \quad n_1 + \dots + n_t = 0.$$

Indeed after gathering terms on the left the different multiplicities n_i must sum to zero, since there are the same number of terms on the left of (1) as on the right. Any c_i for which $n_i = 0$ is discarded, meaning that the sum of the remaining multiplicities is 0 as an element of $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Now since A is separable and the c_i are in A we may relabel them if necessary to assume the existence of a ball $B(x, r)$ such that $c_1 \notin B$ but $c_2, \dots, c_t \in B$. By (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_1 - x\| &= \|n_1 c_1 - n_1 x\| \\ &= \|n_2 c_2 + \dots + n_t c_t + n_1 x\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (3) and the non-archimedean property it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_1 - x\| &= \|n_2(c_2 - x) + \dots + n_t(c_t - x)\| \\ &\leq \max\{\|c_2 - x\|, \dots, \|c_t - x\|\} \\ &\leq r \end{aligned}$$

and hence $c_1 \in B(x, r)$ which is a contradiction. Thus there are no non-trivial solutions and the proof is complete. $\square$

Now that we understand the growth of individual separable sets, we wish to extend our analysis to their disjoint unions. We begin with a prototype result for unions satisfying a particularly strong condition.

Call a disjoint union of sets $\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i$ a *sparse union* if there exist disjoint balls $B_1, \dots, B_N$ such that $A_i \subset B_i$ for each i . The following lemma shows that sets in sparse union behave independently under sumsets.

Lemma 3.3. *If $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ is a sparse union of finite subsets of $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $p \nmid k$ then*

$$|kA| \geq \sum_{i=1}^N |kA_i|.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that the sumsets kA_i are disjoint. So suppose for a contradiction that there are distinct A_i, A_j such that kA_i and kA_j have non-empty intersection. There is then a solution to the equation

$$a_1 + \cdots + a_k = b_1 + \cdots + b_k$$

with $a_s \in A_i$ and $b_r \in A_j$. By definition of a sparse union the sets A_i and A_j are contained in two disjoint balls; call these $B(x_i, r_i)$ and $B(x_j, r_j)$ respectively. Since $p \nmid k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_i - x_j\| &= \|kx_i - kx_j\| \\ &\leq \max\{\|a_1 + \cdots + a_k - kx_i\|, \|b_1 + \cdots + b_k - kx_i\|\} \\ &\leq \max\{\|a_1 - x_i\|, \dots, \|a_k - x_i\|, \|b_1 - x_i\|, \dots, \|b_k - x_i\|\} \\ &\leq \max\{r_i, r_j\} \end{aligned}$$

and so either $x_i \in B(x_j, r_j)$ or $x_j \in B(x_i, r_i)$, contradicting the fact that the two balls are disjoint. $\square$

Combining Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 shows that if $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i$ is a sparse union of separable sets A_i , each of cardinality at least K , then

$$|kA| \gg_k NK^k$$

which is a stronger conclusion than required for Lemma 3.1. However a result is required for *all* disjoint unions rather than only for sparse ones. For the following discussion another new concept is required.

Suppose that A_1 is separable with resolution at least r . Say that a set A_2 is *hidden from* A_1 if A_2 is contained in a ball of radius no greater than r .

We shall presently show that sparse unions and hidden sets cover essentially all the possibilities for a disjoint union of separable sets. But let's first see why this is helpful for proving Lemma 3.1, by showing that if A_2 is hidden from A_1 then the sumset $A_1 + A_2$ is large.

Lemma 3.4. *If $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ are finite sets such that A_2 is hidden from A_1 then*

$$|A_1 + A_2| = |A_1||A_2|.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that there are no solutions to

$$a_1 + a_2 = a'_1 + a'_2$$

with each $a_i, a'_i \in A_i$ and $a_i \neq a'_i$. So suppose for a contradiction that such a solution exists. Since A_1 is separable and $a_1, a'_1 \in A_1$ there is a ball $B(x, r)$ such that $a_1 \in B(x, r)$ but $a'_1 \notin B(x, r)$.

Since A_2 is hidden from A_1 , the ball $B(x, r)$ may be chosen so that there is another ball $B(y, s)$ containing A_2 , with $s \leq r$. By the non-archimedean property,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - a'_1\| &\leq \max\{\|x - a_1\|, \|a_1 - a'_1\|\} \\ &= \max\{\|x - a_1\|, \|a_2 - a'_1\|\} \\ &\leq \max\{\|x - a_1\|, \|y - a_2\|, \|y - a'_1\|\} \\ &\leq \max\{r, s\} \\ &= r \end{aligned}$$

and so $a'_1 \in B(x, r)$ which is a contradiction. $\square$

As a corollary it follows that not only is $A_1 + A_2$ large, but so is $A_1 + kA_2$ for any natural number k .

Corollary 3.5. *If $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ are finite sets such that A_2 is hidden from A_1 then*

$$|A_1 + kA_2| = |A_1||kA_2|$$

for any natural number k .

Proof. By Lemma 3.4 it suffices to show that if A_2 is hidden from A_1 then so is kA_2 . And this follows immediately from Lemma 2.2 and the definition of hidden. $\square$

As promised, we now show that sparse unions and hidden sets cover essentially all the possibilities for a disjoint union of separable sets.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i$ be a disjoint union of separable finite sets $A_i \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$, each of cardinality at least K . Let $\lambda \leq N$ be any integer. Then at least one of the following is true.*

- (1) *A contains a sparse union of at least λ separable sets, each of cardinality $\Omega(K)$.*
- (2) *There exist $A', A'' \subset A$ where $|A'| \gg K$ and A'' is the disjoint union of at least N/λ separable sets, each of cardinality $\Omega(K)$, such that A' is separable and A'' is hidden from A' .*

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that K is even, say $K = 2k$. Since each A_i is separable, write the elements of each A_i as

$$A_i = \{a_{i1}, \dots, a_{i|A_i|}\}$$

such that for $1 \leq j \leq |A_i|$ there is a ball $B(x_{ij}, r_{ij})$ with

$$(4) \quad A_i \cap B(x_{ij}, r_{ij}) = \{a_{i1}, \dots, a_{ij}\}.$$

Note that

$$(5) \quad B(x_{i1}, r_{i1}) \subsetneq B(x_{i2}, r_{i2}) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq B(x_{i|A_i|}, r_{i|A_i|}).$$

Recall that $k = K/2$ and consider the balls $B(x_{ik}, r_{ik})$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Let

$$r = \max_i \{r_{ik}\}$$

and for each i let

$$B_i = B(x_{ik}, r).$$

There are N balls B_i , which may or may not be distinct. There are therefore two possibilities. Either at least λ of them are distinct, or at least N/λ of them are the same. These two cases correspond to the two cases of the conclusion.

If λ of the B_i are distinct then since they have the same radius but are distinct they must be disjoint by Lemma 2.1. The corresponding sets $A_i \cap B_i$ form a sparse union of λ disjoint separable sets since they are contained in the disjoint balls B_i and are subsets of the separable sets A_i . They are all of cardinality $\Omega(K)$ since by (4)

$$|A_i \cap B_i| \geq |A_i \cap B(x_{ik}, r_{ik})| = k \gg K.$$

We are therefore in the first case of the lemma's conclusion.

On the other hand, suppose that at least N/λ of the B_i are the same, say $B_i = B$ for all $i \in I$ with $|I| \geq N/\lambda$. Let i_0 be such that

$$r_{i_0 k} = r$$

and note by (5) that $r_{i_0 j} > r$ whenever $j \geq k+1$. Then let

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= A_{i_0} \setminus B(x_{i_0}, r) = \left\{ a_{i_0(k+1)}, \dots, a_{i_0 K}, \dots, a_{i_0 |A_{i_0}|} \right\} \\ A'' &= \bigcup_{i \in I} (A_i \cap B) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (A_i \cap B(x_i, r)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that A' is separable since it is a subset of A_{i_0} , which is itself separable. And it has cardinality at least $K - k \gg K$. Note also that A'' is the disjoint union of at least N/λ separable sets since each possible $A_i \cap B$ is a subset of the separable set A_i and all of the A_i are disjoint.

All that remains is to verify that A'' is hidden from A' . For this, note first that the separable set A' has resolution strictly greater than r , since it is separated by the balls $B(x_{i_0 j}, r_{i_0 j})$ and $r_{i_0 j} > r$ whenever $j \geq k+1$. Then observe that A'' is contained in a ball of radius at most r , since $A'' \subset B$ and B has radius r . Thus A'' is hidden from A' as required. $\square$

It is now possible to collect the structural information from the previous lemmata to prove Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Proceed by induction on k . The case $k = 1$ is trivial so assume that $k \geq 2$ and apply Lemma 3.6 with $\lambda = \lfloor N^{1/k} \rfloor$. There are two possible cases, which are dealt with in turn.

In the first case, the set A contains a set A_1 that is a sparse union of $\Omega(N^{1/k})$ separable sets, each of cardinality $\Omega(K)$. Split into two further subcases, according to whether or not the characteristic p divides k . If $p \nmid k$ then by Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3,

$$|kA| \geq |kA_1| \gg N^{1/k} K^k \geq N^{1/k} K^{k-1}$$

as required. On the other hand if $p \mid k$ then $p \nmid (k-1)$ and so by Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 again,

$$|kA| \geq |(k-1)A_1| \gg N^{1/(k-1)} K^{k-1} \geq N^{1/k} K^{k-1}$$

as required.

In the second case, there are two subsets A_2 and A_3 of A such that A_2 is separable and of cardinality $\Omega(K)$, A_3 is hidden from A_2 , and A_3 is the disjoint union of $\Omega(N^{1-\frac{1}{k}})$ separable sets each of cardinality $\Omega(K)$. Note that A_3 satisfies the conditions for the lemma we are presently proving and so by inductive hypothesis

$$|(k-1)A_3| \gg_k N^{\frac{1-1/k}{k-1}} K^{k-2} = N^{1/k} K^{k-2}.$$

Then by Corollary 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} |kA| &\gg |A_2 + (k-1)A_3| \\ &\gg |A_2| |(k-1)A_3| \\ &\gg N^{1/k} K^{k-1} \end{aligned}$$

as required. $\square$

4. FINDING MANY SEPARABLE SETS

The goal in this section is to show that if the sumset and product set of a set A are both small then there must exist a large disjoint collection of large separable sets. For this we adapt the argument of Solymosi [2005a] for complex sum-products discussed in Section 2. Note that all of the analysis remains in the $\mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ setting; indeed some of the facts of non-archimedean geometry deployed here are manifestly false in $\mathbb{C}$.

A couple of new definitions are required. For a finite set $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ and an element $a \in A$, define

$$\begin{aligned} r_A(a) &= \min_{\substack{a' \in A \\ a' \neq a}} |a - a'| \\ B_A(a) &= B(a, r_A(a)). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, for any $n \geq 1$ we say that $C = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in A^n$ is an A -chain of length n if $c_i \neq c_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and

$$B_A(c_1) \subset \dots \subset B_A(c_n).$$

The following argument, a strengthened form of that found in Solymosi [2005a], finds a large chain in A as long as the sumset and partial product set are both small. If this condition were to fail then a suitable sum-product result would follow immediately.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $A, D \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ be any finite sets and choose some graph $G \subset A \times D$. Then A contains an A -chain of cardinality*

$$\Omega \left(\frac{|G|^4}{|D|^3 |A + A|^2 |A|^G |D|^2 \log^4 |A|} \right),$$

where the implicit constant is absolute.

The proof of this lemma is rather long and technical; this is partially due to working with a partial product set, which is important for the energy version of our sum-product result. In particular, this is the reason that we need the lemma with general A and D . On a first read-through the reader is advised to take $A = D$ and $G = A^2$; indeed, this is all that is required for a proof of Theorem 1.1. Working with a general $G \subset A^2$ merely requires slightly more notation and some careful pigeonholing at the beginning of the proof.

Proof. For any $d \in D$ let $G_d \subset A$ be defined as $\{a \in A : (a, d) \in G\}$. For each $a \in A$ and $d \in D$ write $N_d(a)$ for the length N of the longest A -chain $C = (c_1, \dots, c_N)$

for which $c_N = a$ and $c_i \in G_d$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. In particular, note that $N_d(a) = 0$ if $a \notin G_d$. Note for future reference that

$$N_d(a) \leq |B_A(a) \cap G_d|$$

since if C is such an A -chain then, letting C' be the set of members of C , it is clear that $C' \subset G_d$ and for each $c \in C'$ we have $c \in B_A(c) \subset B_A(a)$.

We begin with some pigeonholing to prepare our sets for the iteration to follow. Let D' be the set of all $d \in D$ such that $|G_d| \geq |G|/2|D|$. Then

$$|G| = \sum_{d \in D} |G_d| \leq |D| \frac{|G|}{2|D|} + |D'| |A|$$

and hence $|D'| \geq |G|/2|A|$. Fix $d \in D'$ and for each $0 \leq j \leq \log_2 |A|$ define A_{dj} to be the set of $a \in G_d$ for which $2^j \leq N_d(a) < 2^{j+1}$. The A_{dj} partition G_d and so

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\log_2 |A|} |A_{dj}| = |G_d|.$$

By the pigeonhole principle there exists a j for which $|A_{dj}| \gg |G_d|/\log |A| \gg |G|/|D| \log |A|$. Let this be denoted by A_d , and let this choice of 2^j be denoted by k_d , so that for all $a \in A_d$

$$k_d \leq N_d(a) < 2k_d.$$

Having performed this dyadic pigeonholing over G_d for each $d \in D'$ we now perform another dyadic pigeonholing over D' itself. For $0 \leq i \leq \log_2 |A|$ let D'_i be the set of all $d \in D'$ such that $2^i \leq k_d < 2^{i+1}$. Then, once again, the D'_i partition D' and hence there is some $D'' \subset D'$ such that

$$|D''| \gg \frac{|D'|}{\log |A|} \gg \frac{|G|}{|A| \log |A|}$$

and there exists a k such that for all $d \in D''$ we have $k \leq k_d < 2k$. In particular there must exist an A -chain of length at least k and so it suffices to give a lower bound on k of the required order. For the simplest case, which is sufficient if the only goal were to prove Theorem 1.1, it suffices to take $A = D$ and $G = A^2$ so that we may simply take $A'' = A$ and $A_d = A_{d'}$ for all $d, d' \in A$.

Say that a quadruple $(a, b, c, d) \in A^3 \times D$ is good if $d \in D''$, $a \in A_d$, $b \in B_A(a) \cap G_d$,

$$(6) \quad |(A + A) \cap (B_A(a) + c)| \leq \frac{16k|A + A|}{|A_d|}$$

and

$$(7) \quad |(A \cdot^G D) \cap (d \cdot B_A(a))| \leq \frac{16k|A \cdot^G D|}{|A_d|}.$$

Write Q for the number of good quadruples. We shall bound Q from below to obtain

$$(8) \quad Q \gg \frac{k|G|^2}{|D|(\log |A|)^2}$$

and bound it from above to obtain

$$(9) \quad Q \ll \frac{k^2|A + A|^2|A \cdot^G A|^2|D|^2(\log |A|)^2}{|G|^2}.$$

Comparing (8) and (9) will then give the required bound on k .

We shall first establish (8). Fix some $d \in D'' \setminus \{0\}$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a \in A_d} |(A \overset{G}{\cdot} D) \cap (d \cdot B_A(a))| &= \sum_{a \in A_d} \sum_{u \in A \overset{G}{\cdot} D} 1_{u \in d \cdot B_A(a)} \\ &= \sum_{v \in d^{-1} \cdot A \overset{G}{\cdot} D} \sum_{a \in A_d} 1_{v \in B_A(a)} \\ &= \sum_{v \in d^{-1} \cdot A \overset{G}{\cdot} D} |C_d(v)| \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_d(v) = \{a \in A_d : v \in B_A(a)\}.$$

We may choose an ordering of $C_d(v) = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ such that $(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ forms an A -chain. This follows from Lemma 2.1 since for any two $a, b \in C_d(v)$ we have $v \in B_A(a) \cap B_A(b)$ and so either $B_A(a) \subset B_A(b)$ or $B_A(b) \subset B_A(a)$. In particular, since $c_n \in A_d$ and $c_i \in G_d$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we must have

$$|C_d(v)| \leq N_d(c_n) < 2k_d < 4k.$$

In particular

$$\sum_{a \in A_d} |(A \overset{G}{\cdot} D) \cap (d \cdot B_A(a))| < 4k |A \overset{G}{\cdot} D|$$

and hence for at least $3|A_d|/4$ elements a of A_d we have

$$|(A \overset{G}{\cdot} D) \cap (d \cdot B_A(a))| \leq \frac{16k |A \overset{G}{\cdot} D|}{|A_d|}.$$

Of course, the same also holds trivially even if $d = 0$.

Similarly for any fixed $c \in A$

$$|(A + A) \cap (B_A(a) + c)| \leq \frac{16k|A + A|}{|A_d|}$$

holds for at least $3|A_d|/4$ elements $a \in A_d$.

It follows that for any fixed $d \in D''$ and $c \in A$ there are at least $|A_d|/2$ elements $a \in A_d$ such that (6) and (7) both hold. Furthermore for each such $a \in A_d$ there are at least k elements $b \in G_d$ such that $b \in B_A(a) \cap G_d$ since

$$k \leq N_d(a) \leq |B_A(a) \cap G_d|.$$

In total therefore,

$$Q \geq \sum_{d \in D''} \sum_{c \in A} \frac{k|A_d|}{2} \gg \frac{k|G|^2}{|D|(\log|A|)^2}$$

since for each $d \in D''$ we have $|A_d| \gg |G|/(\log|A|)|D|$ and $|D''| \gg |G|/|A|\log|A|$. This concludes the proof of (8).

We now prove (9). Note that the map

$$(a, b, c, d) \mapsto (a + c, b + c, ad, bd)$$

is injective and so it suffices to bound the number of possibilities for this latter expression, subject to the constraint that (a, b, c, d) is good. There are certainly at most $|A + A|$ possibilities for $a + c$ and at most $|A \overset{G}{\cdot} D|$ for ad . We fix $a + c$

and ad and first establish a bound on the number of possible $b + c$. Note that if $a + c = a' + c'$ then either

$$B_A(a) + c \subset B_A(a') + c'$$

or vice versa, since both sets are balls with the same centre $a + c$.

As a consequence, for any $d \in D''$, if $G(d) \subset A_d \times A$ is the set of pairs (a, c) such that (6) holds then for any $x \in A \overset{G(d)}{+} A$ there is a fixed pair (a_{xd}, c_{xd}) such that (6) holds and

$$B_A(a) + c \subset B_A(a_{xd}) + c_{xd}$$

whenever $a + c = x$ and $(a, c) \in A_d \times A$ satisfies (6). In fact, if $G_0 = \cup_{d \in D''} G(d)$ then for any $x \in A \overset{G_0}{+} A$ there is a fixed pair (a_x, c_x) such that (6) holds for some $d \in D''$ and

$$B_A(a) + c \subset B_A(a_x) + c_x.$$

Thus if x is the fixed first co-ordinate and $b + c$ is a possible second co-ordinate then since $b \in B_A(a) \cap A$ and $c \in A$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} b + c &\in (A + A) \cap (B_A(a) + c) \\ &\subset (A + A) \cap (B_A(a_x) + c_x). \end{aligned}$$

In particular there exists a $d \in D''$, depending only on $x = a + c$ which is fixed, such that the number of possibilities for $b + c$ is at most

$$\frac{16k|A + A|}{|A_d|} \ll \frac{k|A + A| |D| \log |A|}{|G|}$$

The argument that there are at most $O(k|A|^G |D| |D| \log |A| / |G|)$ possibilities for bd is similar.

In total therefore

$$Q \ll \frac{k^2 |A + A|^2 |A|^G |D|^2 |D|^2 (\log |A|)^2}{|G|^2}$$

which concludes the proof of (9) and thus of the lemma. $\square$

The following result shows that any chain contains a large separable subset, allowing Lemma 3.1 to be applied to the chains found in Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. *If C is the set of elements of an A -chain for some $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ then C contains a separable set of cardinality at least $|C|/q$.*

Proof. It is clear that any subset $\{c_1, \dots, c_n\} \subset C$ with

$$B_A(c_1) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq B_A(c_n).$$

is separable. Define an equivalence relation on elements of A by $a \sim b$ if and only if $B_A(a) = B_A(b)$. To prove the lemma it suffices to show that each equivalence class contains at most q elements of A .

Note first that if $a \sim b$ and $a \neq b$ then

$$\|a - b\| = r_A(a) = r_A(b).$$

Indeed, since $B_A(a) = B_A(b)$ it follows that $b \in B_A(a)$ and so $\|a - b\| \leq r_A(a)$. However by minimality, $\|a - b\| \geq r_A(a)$ and so $\|a - b\| = r_A(a)$. Similarly $\|a - b\| = r_A(b)$.

Suppose for a contradiction that there is an equivalence class containing elements $a_1, \dots, a_{q+1}$. Consider the differences $a_1 - a_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq q+1$. By the last paragraph we have

$$(10) \quad \|a_i - a_j\| = r_A(a_i) = r_A(a_j)$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq q+1$. To complete the proof it suffices to show that there are distinct i, j and k in $\{1, \dots, q^d + 1\}$ such that

$$(11) \quad \deg(a_i - a_j) < \deg(a_i - a_k),$$

as this yields a contradiction to (10) by the definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Consider the q distinct elements $a_1 - a_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq q+1$. Since none of these are 0 they have leading coefficient belonging to $\mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$, and hence by the pigeonhole principle there are $i \neq j$ such that $a_1 - a_i$ and $a_1 - a_j$ have the same leading coefficient.

It follows that if $\deg(a_1 - a_i) = \deg(a_1 - a_j)$ then $\deg(a_i - a_j) < \deg(a_1 - a_j)$. Hence either way there is a choice of distinct i, j and k such that (11) holds, completing the proof. $\square$

Finally, repeated application of the previous lemmata yields many disjoint large separable sets, which combined with Corollary 3.1 will give the main result.

Corollary 4.3. *If $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q((t^{-1}))$ is a finite set and $G \subset A \times A$ then A contains*

$$\Omega \left(\frac{|A|^{10} |A + A|^2 |A|^{\frac{G}{2}} |A|^2 \log^4 |A|}{|G|^7} \right)$$

disjoint separable sets, each of cardinality

$$\Omega \left(\frac{|G|^8}{q |A|^{11} |A + A|^2 |A|^{\frac{G}{2}} |A|^2 \log^4 |A|} \right).$$

The implicit constants are all absolute.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.1 we can find a subset $A' \subset A$ of size at least $|G|/2|A|$ such that for every $a \in A'$ the set $G_a = \{d \in A : (a, d) \in G\}$ has size at least $|G|/2|A|$.

Let A'' be any subset of A' of cardinality at least $|A'|/2$. Let G' be the graph $\{(a, b) \in G : a \in A''\}$. Applying Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 shows that A'' contains a separable set of cardinality

$$\gg \frac{|G'|^4}{q |A'|^3 |A' + A'|^2 |A'|^{\frac{G}{2}} |A'|^2 \log^4 |A'|}.$$

By our choice of A' and A'' we deduce that $|G'| \gg |G|^2 / |A|^2$. Using the previous bound and the fact that a subset of a separable set is itself separate we deduce that A'' contains a separable set of cardinality k where

$$\frac{|G|^8}{|A|^{11} |A + A|^2 |A|^{\frac{G}{2}} |A|^2 \log^4 |A|} \gg k \gg \frac{|G|^8}{q |A|^{11} |A + A|^2 |A|^{\frac{G}{2}} |A|^2 \log^4 |A|}$$

where the implicit constants are absolute. For brevity let λ denote the quantity on the left hand side of these inequalities.

Let $A_1 = A'$. By the above discussion we can find a separable subset S_1 of cardinality N_1 where $\lambda/q \ll N_1 \ll \lambda$. Now let $A_2 = A_1 \setminus S_1$. If $|A_2| \geq |A'|/2$, then

we can find another separable subset S_2 , of cardinality N_2 where $\lambda/q \ll N_2 \ll \lambda$, such that S_2 is disjoint from S_1 .

We now continue this process until we have some A_n of cardinality less than $|A'|/2$. At least

$$\gg \frac{|A'|}{\lambda} \gg \frac{|A|^{10} |A + A|^2 |A \cdot^G A|^2 \log^4 |A|}{|G|^\tau}$$

iterations are required, after which we have identified the required number of disjoint separable sets, each of the required cardinality. $\square$

Theorem 2.4 follows by combining Lemma 3.1 with Corollary 4.3 as follows.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let

$$N = \frac{|A|^{10} |A + A|^2 |A \cdot^G A|^2 \log^4 |A|}{|G|^\tau}$$

and

$$K = \frac{|G|^8}{q |A|^{11} |A + A|^2 |A \cdot^G A|^2 \log^4 |A|}.$$

By Corollary 4.3, the set A contains a subset U which is a disjoint union of $\Omega(N)$ separable sets, each of cardinality $\Omega(K)$. For any natural number k , Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |kA| &\geq |kU| \\ &\gg_k N^{1/k} K^{k-1} \\ &= \frac{|G|^{8k-8-7/k}}{q^{k-1} |A|^{11k-11-10/k} |A + A|^{2k-2-\frac{2}{k}} |A \cdot^G A|^{2k-2-\frac{2}{k}} \log^{4k-4-\frac{4}{k}} |A|}. \end{aligned}$$

By Plünnecke's inequality (see Petridis [2011] for a recent simple proof) we know that $|kA| \ll \frac{|A+A|^k}{|A|^{k-1}}$ and so

$$|A + A|^{3k-2-\frac{2}{k}} |A \cdot^G A|^{2k-2-\frac{2}{k}} \gg_k \frac{|G|^{8k-8-7/k}}{q^{k-1} |A|^{10k-10-10/k} \log^{4k-4-\frac{4}{k}} |A|}.$$

Taking k -th roots of both sides and using the trivial inequalities $|A + A|, |A \cdot^G A| \geq 1$ and $|G| \leq |A|^2$ gives

$$|A + A|^3 |A \cdot^G A|^2 \gg_k \frac{|G|^8}{q |A|^{10+6/k+4/k^2} \log^{4-\frac{4}{k}-\frac{4}{k^2}} |A|}.$$

Theorem 2.4 follows by taking k sufficiently large depending only on ϵ . $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Oliver Roche-Newton, Misha Rudnev and Trevor Wooley for reading earlier drafts of this paper and many helpful comments and corrections.

REFERENCES

- J. Bourgain. “On the construction of affine extractors” *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 17, no. 1 (2005): 33–57.
- Bourgain, J. and M. Garaev. “On a variant of sum-product estimates and explicit exponential sum bounds in prime fields” *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 146, no. 1 (2009): 1–21.
- Bourgain, J., N. Katz and T. Tao. “A sum-product estimate in finite fields and applications” *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 14, no. 1 (2004): 27–57.
- Croot, E. and D. Hart. “On sums and products in $\mathbb{C}[x]$ ” *Ramanujan J.* 22, no. 1 (2010): 33–54.
- G. Elekes. “On the number of sums and products” *Acta. Arith.* 81, no. 4 (1997): 365–367.
- Erdős, P., and E. Szemerédi. “On sums and products of integers” *Stud. Pure Math.* (1983): 213–218.
- Ford, K. “Sums and products from a finite set of real numbers” *Ramanujan J.* 2, no. 1-2 (1998): 59–66.
- M. Garaev. “An explicit sum-product estimate in $\mathbb{F}_p$ ” *Int. Math. Res. Not.* no. 11 (2007): 1–11.
- M. Garaev. “The sum-product estimate for large subsets of prime fields” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 136, no. 8 (2008): 2735–2739.
- Katz, N., and C. Shen. “A slight improvement to Garaev’s sum product estimate” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 136, no. 7 (2008a): 2499–2504.
- Katz, N., and C. Shen. “Garaev’s inequality in finite fields not of prime order” *Online J. Anal. Comb.* no. 3 (2008b).
- Konyagin, S., and M. Rudnev. “On new sum-product type estimates” preprint available at arXiv:1207.6785.
- Li, L. “Slightly improved sum-product estimates in fields of prime order” *Acta Arith.* 147, no. 2 (2011): 153–160.
- Li, L., and O. Roche-Newton. “An improved sum-product estimate for general finite fields” *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 25, no. 3 (2011): 1285–1296.
- Petridis, G. “Plünnecke’s inequality” *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 20, no. 6 (2011): 921–938.
- M. Nathanson. “On sums and products of integers” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125, no. 1 (1997): 9–16.
- M. Rudnev. “An improved sum-product inequality in fields of prime order” *Int. Math. Res. Notices* 16 (2012): 3693–3704.
- C. Shen. “Quantitative sum product estimates on different sets” *Electron. J. Combin.* 15, no. 1 (2008).
- Solymosi, J. “On sum-sets and product-sets of complex numbers” *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* 17, no. 3 (2005a): 921–924.
- Solymosi, J. “On the number of sums and products” *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 37, no. 4 (2005b): 491–494.
- Solymosi, J. “Bounding multiplicative energy by the sumset” *Adv. Math.* 222, no. 2 (2009): 402–408.
- Tao, T. “The sum-product phenomenon in arbitrary rings” *Contrib. Discrete Math.* 4, no. 2 (2009): 59–82.
- Tao, T., and V. Vu. *Additive Combinatorics*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, UNIVERSITY WALK, CLIFTON, BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `matfb@bristol.ac.uk` and `tgf.jones@bristol.ac.uk`